ORIGINAL IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JOSEPH M. WALLS, Petitioner,

V.

THOMAS CARROLL, Warden, Respondent.

Civil A. NO. 05-585-KAJ

NOV 2 2 2005

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM ORDER

COMES NOW, Joseph M. Walls, who moves this courte aware pursuant to (ivil R. 60(6)(1)(6) for relief from the Court's Order dated November 2, 2005, for the following reasons:

A. 28 U.S.C. 2241

- I. The Court's Order recognized that the Petition sought "federal habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. ... 2241"."

 Order, p. Z.
- Z. The Court's Order then went on to dismiss the Petition "Pursuant to [28 U.S.C.) 2244(6)". Order, pp. 3-4.
- 3. Relief is justified because the Court's Order relying upon 28 U.S.C. 2244 (b) to dismiss the Petition brought under 28 U.S.C. 2241 is mistaken and violates this Circuit's precedent. Zayas V. INS, 311 F.3d 247, 255 (3rd Cir. 2002) (28 U.S.C. 2244 does not apply to 28 U.S.C. 2241).

B. NEW INTERPRETATION

4. The Court's Order recognized that the Petition sought relief to correct the "retroactive application of the newly

- expanded deadly weapon definition" contained within the "post-trial amendment to Delaware's statutory definition of deadly weapon to include baseball bat" that violated both "ex past facto" and "due process". Order, pp. 2-3.
- 5. The Court's Order went on to dismiss the petition stated that the 28 U.S.C. 2241 "petition challenged the same 1988 convictions and sentences he presented" in his earlier 28 U.S.C. 2254 petitions (denied on questionable procedural grounds), and "Walls has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right" Order, pp. 3-4.
- mistaken and violates both this Circuit's and Supreme Court's (a) precedent in that this is the first 28 U.S.C. 2241 petition, (b) and the Court failed to recognize that petitions brought within one year of a court decision which revealed the "simple, inevitable conclusion" that letitioner could not have been guilty of the crimes for which he was convicted, demonstrates "actual innocence", violating due process or expost facto, and excuses any procedural bars. Buckley V. Florida, 123 S.C. 2020, 2022, footnote ** (2003) (deadly weapon definition, prior petitions no bar, could not be guilty of crime, due process or ex post facto violated); Engle V. Isaac, 102 S.C. 1558, 1575-76 (1982) (to protect against fundamental miscarriages of justice procedural bars must yield to the imperative of correcting

a fundamentally unjust incarceration); In re Dorsainvil, 119
Fi3d 245, 248, 253 (3rd Cir. 1997) (prior petitions no bar,
substantive change / clarification, factually or legally innocent,
"may resort to ... 28 U.S.C. 2241"); In re Nwanze, 242 Fi3d
521,525 (3rd Cir. 2001) (prior petitions no bar, substantive
change exposes factual or legal innocence, may resort to
28 U.S.C. 2241).

For these reasons, the Court's Order should be vacated and the 28 U.S.C. 2241 should be granted; or a COA should issue.

Date: November 14, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph M. Walls

Harelm. Waller

ORDER

Having considered the Motion, the Order of November Z, 2005 is vacated and the Petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2241 is hereby granted.

Date Judge

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH M. WALLS

I, Joseph M. Walls, do hereby swear under the penalty of perjury that all statements contained herein are true and accurate, that this Motion is submitted in good faith and not to cause delay, and that copies of this Motion have been served upon the parties listed below, on this date, by placing the Motion in the prison mailbox to be delivered by first class mail.

- 1. Clerk Delaware District Court-844 N. King Street Wilmington, DE 19801
- 2. Hon. M. Jane Brady Attorney General 820 N. French Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Sworn to and Signed this I'th day of November, 2005.

Joseph M. Walls, A.A.S. Dec #107897 Bldg. 5-1 1181 Padlock Road Smyrna, DE 19977

DELAWARE CORREC 1181 PADDOCK ROA SMYRNA, DELAWA

Juffelelelllenaffellettenthelelellelelle 0012

19801+3519-99